



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of:**

**Baorui Yang**

**Serial No.: 10/824,279**

**Filed: April 14, 2004**

**For: METHODS FOR IMPROVING  
ANGLED LINE FEATURE ACCURACY  
AND THROUGHPUT USING ELECTRON  
BEAM LITHOGRAPHY AND ELECTRON  
BEAM LITHOGRAPHY SYSTEM**

**Confirmation No.: 6199**

**Examiner: C. Young**

**Group Art Unit: 1756**

**Attorney Docket No.: 2269-6004US  
(03-0216.00/US)**

**NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING**

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV962536442US

Date of Deposit with USPS: April 5, 2007

Person making Deposit: Cat Bratton

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed February 2, 2007 and sets forth Applicant's comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Notice of Allowance.

In the Notice of Allowance, the Examiner indicates:

[U]pon a complete review of the entire written record the instant application is in condition for allowance. The prior art cited by Applicants effectively sets forth the state of the art. Particular mention is made of U.S. Patent 4,532,598. This patent shows angled features (see Figures 1-6 of the patent). However, the claimed method of producing angled features set forth in the instant application is not shown in any of the prior art. Specifically, the rotation of the rectangular-shaped shot electron beam, either through rotation of the substrate or of the path, to obtain the angled profiles via secondary electron beam exposures.

Applicants concur with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, which is exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The Independent claims as allowed recite features and methodology in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims. Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

**Serial No. 10/824,279**

Respectfully submitted,



Krista Weber Powell  
Registration No. 47,867  
Attorney for Applicant  
**TRASKBRITT**  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: April 5, 2007  
KWP/djp:lmh  
Document in ProLaw